



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/705,758

11/12/2003

Michael A. Willen

1481.0100006

4262

26111

7590

07/22/2008

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.
1100 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

VIZVARY, GERALD C

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3696

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/22/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/705,758	Applicant(s) WILLEN ET AL.	
	Examiner GERALD C. VIZVARY	Art Unit 3696	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 5/7/2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>4/3/2008</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

In the amendment filed 5/7/2008, the following has occurred: claims 9 & 15 have been amended. Now, claims 1-20 are presented for examination.

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 4/3/2008 was considered by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

1. Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 13, 15, 16 & 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Smith 2003/004780.

The listing of claims below will replace all prior versions and listings of claims in the application.

Art Unit: 3696

As per claim 1 (Original), Smith (US 2003/004780 A1) shows a system for forecasting weather-based demand, comprising: a recombination processor;

wherein: said recombination processor is configured to receive weather metric data (“The weather module 103 sends weather requests 209 to the weather information provider. (“Weather information provider 105 translates meteorological data into variables 201 that may be used in the weather module 103.” Smith (US 2003/004780 A1 ¶ [0029]);

said recombination processor is configured to receive a weather factor relationship knowledgebase (“Weather information provider 105 translates meteorological data into variables 201 that may be used in the weather module 103.” Smith (US 2003/004780 A1 ¶ [0029]); and

said recombination processor is configured to produce normalized weather factor metric data (“With respect to data provided by weather information provider 105a and 105b, certain information may be used by weather module 103a and 103b and/or enterprise system 101a and 101b in order to provide specific analysis. Relevant meteorological information should be on a time and geographic scale commensurate with the decision maker's (user's) needs.” Smith (US 2003/004780 A1 ¶ [0035])

As per claim 2 (Original), Smith (US 2003/004780 A1) shows a system of claim 1, wherein said weather factor relationship knowledge base is a weather-impact model (“Scientific and technological advances in the fields of meteorological observations, modeling, forecasting, and use of information have resulted in informational products of

Art Unit: 3696

known accuracy to various degrees. Such informational products range in time scales from the immediate present to years in advance and from spatial scales from a particular point to continents across the globe. Advances in predictability provide the potential for businesses to proactively manage their sensitivities to weather.” Smith (US 2003/004780 A1 ¶ [0020])

As per claim 3 (Original), Smith (US 2003/004780 A1) shows a system of claim 4, wherein said normalized proxy sales history data are derived from at least one of old sales history data for a product from an entity, sales history data for said product from a second entity, sales history data for said product from an outside source, sales history data for a category that includes said product, and sales history data for a proxy product that has a similar weather-based demand relationship as said product.

“The weather module may provide information relevant to component business processes of the enterprise system(s) based on meteorological and climatological information. Meteorological information generally refers to predictive or recent weather information, while climatological information generally refers to historical weather information.” Smith (US 2003/004780 A1 ¶ [0017])

As per claim 4 (Original), Smith (US 2003/004780 A1) further teaches a system of claim 1, further comprising a volatility scaling processor; wherein:
said volatility scaling processor is configured to receive said normalized weather factor metric data;

Art Unit: 3696

said volatility scaling processor is configured to receive volatility scale factor data; and said volatility scaling processor is configured to produce scaled weather factor metric data. ("Such informational products range in time scales from the immediate present to years in advance and from spatial scales from a particular point to continents across the globe. Advances in predictability provide the potential for businesses to proactively manage their sensitivities to weather. "Smith (US 2003/004780 A1 ¶ [0043]) and ("Beyond the forecast time horizon, the weather module may use the climatological database as the sole source of information to calculate the probability of weather events. However, it is also possible that the weather module uses the information provided by the weather information provider to predict whether a threshold is or may be exceeded within the forecast time horizon, and use information in the climatological database to help calculate the probability, or accuracy, of the prediction." Smith (US 2003/004780 A1 ¶ [0043])

As per claim 5 (Original), Smith (US 2003/004780 A1) further teaches a system of claim 6, further comprising a deaggregation processor; wherein: said deaggregation processor is configured to receive said scaled weather factor metric data; said deaggregation processor is configured to receive deaggregation data; and said deaggregation processor is configured to produce deaggregated weather factor metric data. ("Weather information provider 105 translates meteorological data into variables 201 that may be used in the weather module 103. Enterprise system 101 translates user-defined thresholds and probability criteria 203 for particular actions

Art Unit: 3696

related to component business processes 113 (FIG. 1) into variables that may be used in the enterprise planning system. The enterprise system 101 then communicates information 205 to weather module 103, which analyzes the data provided and communicates results 207 of the analysis to enterprise planning system 101 in order to incorporate weather information into component business processes. The weather module 103 sends weather requests 209 to the weather information provider. Each weather request may be a one time request on an as needed basis, or it may be a request for types of information (precipitation amount, wind direction, wind speed, etc.) that the weather module should receive from the weather information provider on a continued basis. Smith (US 2003/004780 A1 ¶ [0029])

As per claim 9 (Currently Amended) Smith (US 2003/004780 A1) shows a method for forecasting weather-based demand, comprising the steps of:

- (1) receiving receiving, at a processor, weather metrics data;
 - (2) ~~receiving~~ receiving, at the processor, a weather factor relationship knowledgebase;
- and
- (3) ~~forecasting~~ forecasting, at the processor, the weather-based demand by using the weather metrics data and the weather factor relationship knowledgebase. ("With respect to data provided by weather information provider 105a and 105b, certain information may be used by weather module 103a and 103b and/or enterprise system 101a and 101b in order to provide specific analysis. Relevant meteorological information should

Art Unit: 3696

be on a time and geographic scale commensurate with the decision maker's (user's) needs.” Smith (US 2003/004780 A1 ¶ [0035])

As per claim 10 (Original), Smith (US 2003/004780 A1) shows a method of claim 9, wherein the weather factor relationship knowledgebase is a weather-impact model. (“Weather information provider 105 translates meteorological data into variables 201 that may be used in the weather module 103.” Smith (US 2003/004780 A1 ¶ [0029]);

As per claim 13 (Original), Smith (US 2003/004780 A1) shows a method of claim 9, further comprising the step of: scaling the weather-based demand. (“Beyond the forecast time horizon, the weather module may use the climatological database as the sole source of information to calculate the probability of weather events. However, it is also possible that the weather module uses the information provided by the weather information provider to predict whether a threshold is or may be exceeded within the forecast time horizon, and use information in the climatological database to help calculate the probability, or accuracy, of the prediction.” Smith (US 2003/004780 A1 ¶ [0043])

As per claim 15 (Currently Amended), Smith (US 2003/004780 A1) shows a computer program product for forecasting weather-based demand, said computer program product having computer program code means embodied in a computer useable medium, said computer program code means comprising:

Art Unit: 3696

a first program code means for ~~receiving~~ receiving, at a processor weather metrics data;
a second program code means for ~~receiving~~ receiving, at a processor a weather factor relationship knowledgebase; and

a third program code means for ~~forecasting~~ forecasting, at the processor the weather-based demand by using the weather metrics data and the weather factor relationship knowledgebase. (“With respect to data provided by weather information provider 105a and 105b, certain information may be used by weather module 103a and 103b and/or enterprise system 101a and 101b in order to provide specific analysis. Relevant meteorological information should be on a time and geographic scale commensurate with the decision maker’s (user’s) needs.” Smith (US 2003/004780 A1 ¶ [0035])

As per claim 16 (Original), Smith (US 2003/004780 A1) shows a computer program product of claim 15, wherein the weather factor relationship knowledgebase is a weather-impact model. (“Weather information provider 105 translates meteorological data into variables 201 that may be used in the weather module 103.” Smith (US 2003/004780 A1 ¶ [0029])

As per claim 19 (Original), Smith (US 2003/004780 A1) shows a computer program product of claim 15, further comprising: a fourth program code means for scaling the weather-based demand. (“Beyond the forecast time horizon, the weather module may use the climatological database as the sole source of information to calculate the probability of weather events. However, it is also possible that the weather module uses

the information provided by the weather information provider to predict whether a threshold is or may be exceeded within the forecast time horizon, and use information in the climatological database to help calculate the probability, or accuracy, of the prediction.” Smith (US 2003/004780 A1 ¶ [0043])

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 3, 4, 8, 11, 12, 14, 17, 18 & 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith (US 2003/004780 A1) in view of Phillips 6,473,084 B1.

As per claim 3, Smith (US 2003/004780 A1) shows a system of claim 2,

Smith (US 2003/004780 A1) fails to show a weather-impact model comprising at least one of an empirical scoring matrix, a weather indices' template, and a proxy model conditions template

Phillips 6,473,084 B1 teaches “In the preferred embodiment of the invention, vectors of forecasts for each individual are used as the columns in a matrix, with each row associated with a particular forecast date.” (Phillips 6,473,084 B1 col. 44 lines 54-57). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Smith (US 2003/004780 A1) to include an empirical scoring

Art Unit: 3696

matrix for forecasting in order to " group data points so that the groups are as much alike as they can reasonably be, but also so the groups are as reasonably different from other groups as they can be." Phillips 6,473,084 B1 col. 44 lines 46-49)

As per claim 4, Smith (US 2003/004780 A1) shows a system of claim 2.

Smith (US 2003/004780 A1) fails to explicitly show the analysis of proxy sales data.

The examiner takes official notice that the use of proxy data is well known in the art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Smith (US 2003/004780 A1) to include the analysis of proxy data since the data in a proxy set more complete and covers a longer time frame than that of the sales data set.

As per claim 8 Smith (US 2003/004780 A1) shows a system of claim 1, further comprising a deaggregation processor; wherein:

said deaggregation processor is configured to receive said normalized weather factor metric data;

said deaggregation processor is configured to receive deaggregation data; and said deaggregation processor is configured to produce deaggregated weather factor metric data. ("Weather information provider 105 translates meteorological data into variables 201 that may be used in the weather module 103. Enterprise system 101 translates user-defined thresholds and probability criteria 203 for particular actions related to component business processes 113 (FIG. 1) into variables that may be used

Art Unit: 3696

in the enterprise planning system. The enterprise system 101 then communicates information 205 to weather module 103, which analyzes the data provided and communicates results 207 of the analysis to enterprise planning system 101 in order to incorporate weather information into component business processes. The weather module 103 sends weather requests 209 to the weather information provider. Each weather request may be a one time request on an as needed basis, or it may be a request for types of information (precipitation amount, wind direction, wind speed, etc.) that the weather module should receive from the weather information provider on a continued basis. Smith (US 2003/004780 A1 ¶ [0029])

Smith (US 2003/004780 A1) fails to explicitly show data normalization.

Phillips 6,473,084 B teaches ("Each user's IB then preferably is divided by the count of the number of items that the user rated during the Assessment Period to generate an "Intensity Weight (IW)". The point values assigned by a user (either for access alone, ratings alone or both) are then multiplied by the Intensity Weight to generate modified points." Phillips 6,473,084 B col. 41 lines 31-35)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Smith (US 2003/004780 A1) to include normalization of data since "users whose ratings exhibit a bias relative to the norm might be adjusted so that the user's central tendency is more aligned with the group norm. Phillips 6,473,084 B col. 41 lines 52-55)

As per claim 11, Smith (US 2003/004780 A1) shows a method of claim 10, wherein the weather-impact model comprises at least one of an empirical scoring matrix, a weather indices template, and a proxy model conditions template.

Smith (US 2003/004780 A1) fails to show a weather-impact model comprising at least one of an empirical scoring matrix, a weather indices' template, and a proxy model conditions template

Phillips 6,473,084 B1 teaches "In the preferred embodiment of the invention, vectors of forecasts for each individual are used as the columns in a matrix, with each row associated with a particular forecast date." (Phillips 6,473,084 B1 col. 44 lines 54-57). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Smith (US 2003/004780 A1) to include an empirical scoring matrix for forecasting in order to " group data points so that the groups are as much alike as they can reasonably be, but also so the groups are as reasonably different from other groups as they can be." Phillips 6,473,084 B1 col. 44 lines 46-49)

As per claim 12, Smith (US 2003/004780 A1) shows a method of claim 10, wherein the weather-impact model is derived from an analysis of normalized proxy sales history data.

Smith (US 2003/004780 A1) fails to explicitly show the analysis of proxy sales data.

The examiner takes official notice that the use of proxy data is well known in the art.

Art Unit: 3696

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Smith (US 2003/004780 A1) to include the analysis of proxy data since the data in a proxy set more complete and covers a longer time frame than that of the sales data set.

As per claim 14, Smith (US 2003/004780 A1) shows a method of claim 9,

Smith 2003/004780: fails to explicitly show deaggregating the weather-based demand.

Phillips 6,473,084 teaches “Additional features of the invention include: also displaying on the same graph historical values for other variables; providing the ability to display the historical data and/or the predicted value for the prediction variable with respect to a different independent variable than in the initial graph; displaying multiple variables on an initial graph in a first view (e.g., a time series view) and then permitting the participant to obtain a view that is a rotation of the first view (e.g., a cross-maturity comparison view “ Phillips 6,473,084 col. 9, lines 39-47).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Smith (US 2003/004780 A1) to include deaggregation of weather-based demand data in order to provide the ability to display the historical data and/or the predicted value for the prediction variable with respect to a different independent variable than in the initial graph (Phillips 6,473,084 B1 col. 9, line 41-43)

As per claim 17, Smith (US 2003/004780 A1) shows a computer program product of claim 16,

Art Unit: 3696

Smith (US 2003/004780 A1) fails to show a weather-impact model comprising at least one of an empirical scoring matrix, a weather indices' template, and a proxy model conditions template

Phillips 6,473,084 B1 teaches "In the preferred embodiment of the invention, vectors of forecasts for each individual are used as the columns in a matrix, with each row associated with a particular forecast date." (Phillips 6,473,084 B1 col. 44 lines 54-57). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Smith (US 2003/004780 A1) to include an empirical scoring matrix for forecasting in order to " group data points so that the groups are as much alike as they can reasonably be, but also so the groups are as reasonably different from other groups as they can be." Phillips 6,473,084 B1 col. 44 lines 46-49)

As per claim 18, Smith (US 2003/004780 A1) shows a computer program product of claim 16.

Smith (US 2003/004780 A1) fails to explicitly show the analysis of proxy sales data.

The examiner takes official notice that the use of proxy data is well known in the art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Smith (US 2003/004780 A1) to include the analysis of proxy data since the data in a proxy set more complete and covers a longer time frame than that of the sales data set.

As per claim 20, Smith (US 2003/004780 A1) shows a computer program product of claim 15.

Smith 2003/004780: fails to explicitly show deaggregating the weather-based demand.

Phillips 6,473,084 teaches “Additional features of the invention include: also displaying on the same graph historical values for other variables; providing the ability to display the historical data and/or the predicted value for the prediction variable with respect to a different independent variable than in the initial graph; Displaying multiple variables on an initial graph in a first view (e.g., a time series view) and then permitting the participant to obtain a view that is a rotation of the first view (e.g., a cross-maturity comparison view “ Phillips 6,473,084 col. 9, lines 39-47).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Smith (US 2003/004780 A1) to include deaggregation of weather-based demand data in order to provide the ability to display the historical data and/or the predicted value for the prediction variable with respect to a different independent variable than in the initial graph (Phillips 6,473,084 B1 col. 9, line 41-43)

Response to Arguments

1. In the remarks filed on 5/7/2008, Applicant argues that “Smith does not disclose, teach or suggest receiving, at a processor, weather metrics data.”

In response the Examiner respectfully refers to Fig. 2 which clearly shows weather information provider (105) sending weather variable information (201) to the weather module (103). Smith (US 2003/004780 A1) further recites “FIG. 2 shows a data flow diagram for data sent and received within the above-described architecture. Weather information provider 105 translates meteorological data into variables 201 that may be used in the weather module 103.” (Smith US 2003/004780 A1 ¶ [0029])

Conclusion

2. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gerald C. Vizvary whose telephone number is 571-270-3268. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ella Colbert can be reached on 571-272-6741. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-270-4268.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Ella Colbert/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3696

Gerald Vizvary
Patent Examiner, A.U. 3696
July 16, 2008